

TO: TOM REIFER  
FROM: DAN ELLSBERG

Nuclear Weapons

kinds of arms  
each other, cov-  
weapons devel-  
process will be  
orries, by the  
which U.S. and  
grams are likely  
On both sides,"  
to predict, bu-  
great zest and  
confrontational  
ge' and 'cheat-

tensions is more  
than any other  
petition. Nuclear  
"emancipat[ed]  
thinking," and  
nains locked into  
ese countries by  
nuclear arsenals"  
sturbingly that

ent in this nu-  
continue to  
sions in the  
relationship.  
de modernizes  
strategic forces,  
I find reason to  
ffs on each side  
perform calcula-  
e whether the  
used to be The  
omehow launch  
out having to  
and certain  
Such Cold War  
to persist, like a  
ng after the con-  
ded. (p. 25)

a growing body of  
poses a Russian-  
Community aimed  
oint activities and  
and to "eradicate  
frontation through-  
y establishments."  
that "the nuclear  
des will provide the

lever and the fulcrum to create a de-  
fense community" (p. 29). He pro-  
poses negotiations aimed at creating a  
new nuclear balance "that would be  
without its thousands of missiles,  
primed to retaliate instantly against an  
enemy first strike," and in which U.S.  
and Russian nuclear forces "will co-  
exist side by side—much like the  
French and British nuclear forces—  
without the adversarial concern about  
the 'stability' of mutual deterrence"  
(p. 30).

Iklé's ideas are similar to those  
emerging from ongoing work by Sergei  
Rogov and others at the Institute of  
U.S.A. and Canada Studies in Moscow  
and point the way to a deeper and  
broader resolution of the Cold War  
than would come from mere changes  
in nuclear doctrine or cuts in numbers  
(Rogov 1992). They are theoretically  
compatible with any of the three  
schools—Minimal, Moderate, or Maxi-  
mal—outlined above. Iklé's point is  
an important one: no matter what each  
side does with its own nuclear forces,  
building bridges between the two may  
mean the difference between contin-  
ued partnership and a new Cold War.  
What is required now is a more de-  
tailed study of what a nonadversarial  
U.S.-Russian nuclear relationship  
would look like.

### For Once, A Hopeful Future

Already it is clear that the 1990s are to  
be a fundamentally new period in the  
nuclear era. It will be a time of un-  
precedented reductions in numbers  
and shifts in strategy. In this dynamic  
era, the traditional schools of Maxi-  
malism and Minimalism may not be  
fully appropriate—as indeed neither  
may have been even during the Cold  
War. U.S. (and Russian) nuclear strat-  
egists face fundamentally new chal-  
lenges today: how to develop a nuclear

strategy for regional contingencies,  
how low to allow their arsenals to fall  
before halting the process of reduc-  
tions, how to develop nuclear strate-  
gies appropriate for a world without a  
major, global threat. The current lit-  
erature on nuclear strategy contains  
many good suggestions. Yet some of  
the crucial questions about deep cuts  
and minimum deterrence, left unat-  
tended for so long during the Cold  
War, remain to be answered.

*The research for this article was made possible in part by a generous grant from the W. Alton Jones Foundation.*

### References

- Ball, Desmond, and Robert C. Toth. 1990. "Revising the SIOP: Taking War-Fighting to Dangerous Extremes." *International Security* 14 (Spring), pp. 65-92.
- Blair, Bruce. 1985. *Strategic Command and Control: Redefining the Nuclear Threat*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Blechman, Barry. 1989. "Triad, Schmid." *New Republic*, February 6, pp. 15-17.
- Blight, James G. 1990. *The Shattered Crystal Ball: Fear and Learning in the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Savage, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew. 1991. "Selective Global Commitment." *Foreign Affairs* 70 (Fall), pp. 1-20.
- Budiansky, Stephen, and Bruce Auster. 1992. "Tackling the New Nuclear Arithmetic." *U.S. News and World Report*, January 20, p. 38.
- Bundy, McGeorge. 1969. "To Cap the Vol-  
cano." *Foreign Affairs* 48 (October), pp. 1-20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. "Nuclear Weapons and the  
Gulf." *Foreign Affairs* 70 (Fall), pp. 83-94.
- Chernoff, Fred. 1990. "START or Finish? The  
Future of Strategic Arms Control and Profound  
Force Reductions." *Defense Analysis* 6, no. 3,  
pp. 235-254.
- Congressional Budget Office. 1991. *The START  
Treaty and Beyond*. Washington, D.C.: U.S.  
GPO.
- Coté, Owen. 1991. "The Trident and the  
Triad: Collecting the D-5 Dividend." *Inter-  
national Security* 16 (Fall), pp. 117-145.
- Daugherty, William, Barbara Levi, and Frank

- von Hippel. 1986. "The Consequences of 'Limited' Nuclear Attacks on the United States." *International Security* 10 (Spring), pp. 3-45.
- Dowler, Thomas W., and Joseph S. Howard II. 1991. "Countering the Threat of the Well-Armed Tyrant: A Modest Proposal for Small Nuclear Weapons." *Strategic Review* 19 (Fall), pp. 34-40.
- Earle, Ralph II, and John B. Rhinelander. 1992. "Wrong Way on Nuclear Arms." *Washington Post*, January 21, 1992, p. A-19.
- Ermarth, Fritz. 1981. "Contrasts in American and Soviet Strategic Thought." In Derek Leebaert, ed., *Soviet Military Thinking*. London: Allen and Unwin, pp. 50-69.
- Feiveson, Harold A. 1989. "Finite Deterrence." In Henry Shue, ed., *Nuclear Deterrence and Moral Restraint*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 271-291.
- Feiveson, Harold A., and Frank N. von Hippel. 1990. "Beyond START: How to Make Much Deeper Cuts." *International Security* 15 (Summer), pp. 154-180.
- Finnegan, Philip, and George Leopold. 1992. "Budget Cuts Fuel Debate on Nuclear Strategies." *Defense News*, January 20, p. 1.
- Garwin, Richard. 1988. "A Blueprint for Radical Weapons Cuts." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 44 (March), pp. 10-13.
- Glaser, Charles. 1990. *Analyzing Strategic Nuclear Policy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Goldberg, Andrew C. 1991. "Ballistic Missile Defense and the Withering of U.S. Defense Strategy." *The Washington Quarterly* 14 (Autumn), pp. 135-144.
- Heisbourg, François. 1989. "The British and French Nuclear Forces: Current Roles and New Challenges." *Survival* 31 (July-August), pp. 301-320.
- Iklé, Fred C. 1991/92. "Comrades in Arms: The Case for a Russian-American Defense Community." *National Interest* no. 26 (Winter), pp. 22-32.
- Jervis, Robert. 1984. *The Illogic of American Nuclear Strategy*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Jones, David. 1990. "General David Jones: Redefining Security, Expanding Arms Control." *Arms Control Today* 20 (October), pp. 3-7.
- Kaysen, Carl, Robert S. McNamara, and George W. Rathjens. 1991. "Nuclear Weapons After the Cold War." *Foreign Affairs* 70 (Fall), pp. 95-110.
- Kent, Glenn A., and David E. Thaler. 1990. "First-Strike Stability and Strategic Defenses: Part II of a Methodology for Evaluating Strategic Forces." R-3918-AF. Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation.
- Kortunov, Sergei. 1990. "START II and Beyond." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 46 (October), pp. 21-23.
- Kull, Steven. 1988. *Minds at War: Nuclear Reality and the Inner Conflicts of Defense Policymakers*. New York, N.Y.: Basic Books.
- McNamara, Robert. 1986. *Blundering Into Disaster: Surviving the First Century of the Nuclear Age*. New York, N.Y.: Pantheon Books.
- May, Michael M., George F. Bing, and John D. Steinbruner. 1988. *Strategic Arms Reductions*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Mazarr, Michael J. 1990. "Beyond Counterforce." *Comparative Strategy* 9 (April-June), pp. 147-162.
- Mueller, John. 1989. *Retreat from Doomsday: The Obsolescence of Major War*. New York, N.Y.: Basic Books.
- National Academy of Sciences. 1991. *The Future of the U.S.-Soviet Nuclear Relationship*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.
- Nitze, Paul. 1990. "America: An Honest Broker." *Foreign Affairs* 69 (Fall), pp. 1-14.
- Perkovich, George. 1991-92. "Counting the Costs of the Arms Race." *Foreign Policy* no. 85 (Winter), pp. 83-105.
- Reed, Thomas C., and Michael O. Wheeler. 1991. "The Role of Nuclear Weapons in the New World Order." Washington, D.C., December. Mimeo.
- Rogov, Sergei. 1992. "International Security and the Collapse of the Soviet Union." *The Washington Quarterly* 15 (Spring), pp. 15-28.
- Sagan, Scott D. 1989. *Moving Targets: Nuclear Strategy and National Security*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Sagdeev, Roald, and Andrei Kokoshin. 1990. "Stability of the Nuclear Balance After Deep Reductions." In Frank von Hippel and Sagdeev, eds., *Reversing the Arms Race*. New York, N.Y.: Gordon and Breach, pp. 9-21.
- Slocombe, Walter B. 1991. "The Continued Need for Extended Deterrence." *The Washington Quarterly* 14 (Autumn), pp. 157-172.
- Sloss, Leon. 1990. "Reexamining Nuclear Policy in a Changing World." Report no. 11. Los Alamos, N. Mex.: Center for Defense Studies.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. "U.S. Strategic Arms Reductions and the Cold War: Policies and Politics." *The Washington Quarterly* 14 (Autumn), pp. 1-23.
- Smith, R. Jeffrey. 1992. "The Future of the U.S.-Soviet Nuclear Relationship." *The Washington Quarterly* 15 (Spring), pp. 15-28.

- zg Affairs 70 (Fall),
- d E. Thaler. 1990. Strategic Defenses: or Evaluating Stra- F. Santa Monica,
- START II and Be- ic Scientists 46 (Oc-
- at War: Nuclear Re- of Defense Policymak- Books.
- Blundering Into Di- entury of the Nuclear heon Books.
- F. Bing, and John Strategic Arms Reductions. Brookings Institution.
- "Beyond Counter- egy 9 (April-June),
- reat from Doomsday: ar. New York, N.Y.:
- nces. 1991. The Fu- Nuclear Relationship. nal Academy of Sci-
- ica: An Honest Bro- all), pp. 1-14.
- 92. "Counting the Foreign Policy no. 85
- ichael O. Wheeler. ear Weapons in the hington, D.C., De-
- nternational Security Soviet Union." The spring), pp. 15-28.
- ring Targets: Nuclear rity. Princeton, N.J.: s.
- rei Kokoshin. 1990. Balance After Deep on Hippel and Sag- rms Race. New York, , pp. 9-21.
91. "The Continued rrence." The Wash- , pp. 157-172.
- amining Nuclear Pol- " Report no. 11. Los
- Alamos, N. Mex.: Center for National Security Studies.
- . 1991. "U.S. Strategic Forces After the Cold War: Policies and Strategies." *The Washington Quarterly* 14 (Autumn), pp. 145-155.
- . Smith, R. Jeffrey. 1992. "U.S. Urged to Cut 50% of A. Arms." *Washington Post*, January 6, p. A-1.
- Wander, W. Thomas, Elizabeth J. Kirk, and Eric H. Arnett, eds. 1989. *Science and Security: Technology and Arms Control for the 1990s*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science.